of the
PACIFIC
LIBRARY

PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

SEPTEMBER 1960 Vol. IV No. 5

ARGUMENTS AND EXPERIENCE

1s. 6d.

PRISM
NEEDS
REGULAR
SUBSCRIBERS

Editors
ROBIN DENNISTON
CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

Business Manager
ROBIN MINNEY

All subscriptions, cheques, articles and correspondence to :—
PRISM, 7, Tufton Street, London, S.W.1
Telephone : ABBey 3760

Subscription rates *(post free)* :
3 months, 5s.
6 months, 10s.
12 months, 20s.
Prism can also be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
FOCUS	Donald Allchin	1
LIFE FOR LIFE	Valerie Pitt	5
THERMODYNAMICS, PSI AND GOD	R. M. Appleby	9
COMMENT		16
ARGUMENTS AND EXPERIENCE		
CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP AGAIN	Brian Rice	20
A LETTER TO MR. DARTON	W. H. Saumary Smith	26
AN ORDINAND IN INDUSTRY	Michael Routh	28
BERNARD WILLIAMS'S IMAGE : A REPLY	Gina Alexander	29
A PLEA FOR SPECIALISTS	M. Z. Brooke	31
LETTERS		33

Focus

DONALD ALLCHIN

One of the themes which has most constantly recurred in the pages of *Prism* is the importance of a living theology, of a renewal of the integrity of Christian thinking. Because our pages have not infrequently contained protests against this or that feature of our present-day church life, or pleas for new experiments and for a spirit of boldness in church affairs, some people have thought that we paid little heed either to deeper theological problems, or to the whole tradition of Christian thought and devotion. But in fact nothing could be further from the truth. If we have been pushed into a violent questioning of certain current ecclesiastical habits of thought, or a vigorous advocacy of certain practical measures of reform, this has been not in spite of, but precisely because of our concern for the wholeness of the faith of the Bible, expressed and made known in the life and liturgy of the church. Nothing could be more futile than an attempt to invent some new little religion of our own, nothing could be more dangerous than that we should fall into the common Anglican temptation of experimenting with practical measures of reform, without any attempt to penetrate to the underlying theological issues.

These reflections have been prompted in the first place, by a book of Sermons, by Sir Edwyn Hoskyns recently published by S.P.C.K.* It is surprising that a group of sermons, written more than twenty-five years ago, and not intended for publication should have such a striking effect. And yet the unfinished sketches of a great artist are sometimes of as great an interest as the finished masterpiece, and these sermons, unfinished and incomplete as they are, tell us much of the mind and work of one of the greatest of Biblical scholars of this country. They tell us much of the mind of one who was convinced to the marrow of his bones that the study of the Bible as the basis of theology, was not the specialism of a few academics and clergymen, but the foundation of all fruitful human life and knowledge.

Reading these sermons through one begins to understand more clearly the influence which Hoskyns had when he was at the height of his powers as a teacher in Cambridge during the twenties and thirties. Here is a man who has realised to the full the nature of Karl Barth's prophetic witness, but who is all the time seeing it, set in the context of the church's life; who is proclaiming with authority the indissoluble link between Bible and Church. Here is a man who in his study of the Bible is conscious not of mastering a

* Seraph Books, 5s. 6d.

certain subject, but by being mastered by the living Word of God.

> "The proper study of the Scriptures inevitably carries with it judgement uttered over us, and a trembling, uncertain, cry for the mercy of God, however full of good works we may be . . . ."

It is the Bible which judges us, and not we the Bible, which brings us again to face the scandal of revelation of God's power and glory, in the weakness and insignificance of particular events.

> "Those of us who, however unworthily, have to do the work of theologians are perpetually faced, I will not say by this problem, for we are wearied by the word problem, but by the almost intolerable burden, that the whole material which we are supposed to interpret, and to which we have to bear witness, is filled with the scandal of Historical Theology".

One of the most striking qualities in these sermons is the way in which they combine a great appreciation of human knowledge and goodness, with an overwhelming sense of the judgement which God's holiness brings upon them. When Sir Edwyn writes,

> "The Bible is held together by one great theme, and its authors are moving along one line. The Biblical writers are pushed on and on until they stand at the place where human achievement, human civilisation, is seen to be less secure than it seems to be. The Biblical writers are pushed on and on until human works, even good works, are seen to fail to attain their goal, until they are clearly seen to be, in fact, human. The writers of the books of the Bible have discovered that they are poor, that they have no secure place upon which to stand. They have discovered that they are men, and not God. They stand where the Tower of Babel falls ; they have seen the Christ crucified",

he does not write as one who despises or is ignorant of the achievements of civilization. He is not adopting the easy despair of the anti-intellectual Bible-worshipper. Rather, it is out of the honesty and integrity of Biblical scholarship, that this judgement upon man's efforts is pronounced. It is through the exercise of the highest faculties of our mind that we are to arrive at the knowledge which is beyond knowledge.

The fact that during the last thirty years the psychological attractions of highly authoritarian and anti-rational forms of religion have grown considerably stronger makes it necessary to emphasise this point. One of the most interesting sermons in the book is devoted to the subject of the textual criticism of the New Testament.

> "This criticism," he writes, "is familiar to those who are definitely theological students, and may seem extremely dull to those who are not. Nevertheless it illustrates the patient observance of many nameless Christians, and has been particularly associated

with this University for the last hundred and fifty years. In attempting to outline a piece of Christian work, I am not concerned to give information, but to do something to re-establish confidence in the ability of Christian faith to promote detailed and accurate observation and to develop integrity of judgement."

Our own generation, threatened as it is by many extreme forms of authoritarianism, needs surely still more to regain that confidence, and to have the courage to see,

> "that the Church of God is in very truth capable of producing that combination of goodness and free intelligence which is denoted by the word wisdom".

Again, in the two sermons on the Pharisees, which give the book its title, the writer is at pains to point out the real goodness in the religion of the Pharisees. Our Lord in His denunciation of them,

> "does not mean that the Pharisees should not demand that tithe should be collected, or that they should not perform their external religious duties in the synagogue ; still less does He for one moment suggest that they should cease to busy themselves with an earnest study of the Scriptures, or that they should cease to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem . . . . Our Lord does not seek to destroy the visible matter of piety. These things, he says, ye ought to have done, and ye are right in your meticulous care ; *but* all these things are meaningless unless they be at each point related to that which lies invisibly beyond them ; unless, that is to say, they be seen in relation to the judgement and the mercy of God".

This point is made still more clearly in the consideration of our Lord's use of the word "hypocrites" in connection with the Pharisees.

> "It does not mean one who intentionally pretends to be what he is not, who consciously plays a part. It means almost the opposite. It means in our Lord's mouth a man who, *entrusted with the truth of God, separated in order to proclaim it, and actually proclaiming it, fails to see what his own religious words and his actions mean, and supposes that they are his own words and his actions*, and who therefore in speaking of God, is in fact only speaking of himself." (my italics).

It would be difficult to imagine a more frightening indictment of ourselves than this, of our present church life at its most successful moments ; difficult too, to express more clearly, a truth which has been seeking for expression in these pages of this magazine.

Needless to say, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns does not provide us with convenient answers to the questions we are asking. Rather he is anxious to prevent us falling for sentimental over-simplifications.

> "There is no corruption that threatens a country so surely as the corruption or sentimentalising of its religion."

But he does provide us with a basis from which our thinking may be able to advance, the basis of a faith in the faithfulness of God. In the second of two sermons on "The Scandal of the Bible" he outlines in a truly magisterial way the structure of Christian orthodoxy, the many-sided wisdom of God, revealed in the perplexing pages of the Scriptures, preserved from all attempts at smoothing down in the creeds and liturgy of the church. It is this which demands our thought and our attention, the most complete service of our minds.

> "Mere goodness or mere piety cannot of themselves secure the continuance of the Christian religion. The Gospel must be declared, and in order to declare it, there must be more clear perception of what it is, and what it implies."

But given that foundation may we not hope to see,

> "theology once again creative in the field of truth",

the Word of God, informing and giving meaning to the words and works of men?

It is this hope which has inspired a good part of the writing which has appeared in *Prism*. For certainly during the years since Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' death many of the principles which he was struggling to assert have come to be more widely realised. Biblical scholars are now more frequently concerned to expound the Biblical message as a whole, to seek to lay bare the great master themes which link Old and New Testaments. A whole generation has grown up which acknowledges the inspiration of men like Hoskyns. But we have to admit that Biblical Theology itself tends to live in a closed and sometimes specialised world. The need for more systematic and dogmatic theology in the Church of England remains as great as ever. In too many University faculties and Theological colleges, men are still studying the history of doctrine, and acquiring information about the Bible, without ever learning to think theologically, without ever coming under the judgement of the Word of God, without ever finding that prayer and theological thinking must condition and grow out of one another.

> "It is not enough for us to know what was fixed as the orthodox expression; we must have our minds trained affectionately in the orthodox consciousness which is deeper and larger than that expression."

So wrote Fr. Benson more than sixty years ago and his words have a striking relevance to our time. It is only as we are learning to live in that orthodox consciousness in that fullness of the Christian revelation, founded in the Scriptures worked out in the church, that we shall be able to see the application of the Gospel to our present age, and be able effectively to bring about those practical reforms in our church's structure and life which are so urgently needed today.

Life for Life

VALERIE PITT

I do not now, Good Lord, give my mind to the qualities of your Godhead, but I offer what I am to What You Are.

This is an *act of prayer*, that is, a form of words in which the Christian articulates the intention of his soul towards God, by which he binds his attention to the Lord. It is paraphrased from *The Epistle of Privy Counsel* but the turn of modern English will not, in a single sentence, allow for the distinction which the letter writer, a good scholastic, makes between God's actions and attributes, and His Being or Essence. The distinction is vital to the prayer. The contemplative to whom the letter is written is advised to shut his mind not only to worldly things, but to all *curious seeking* in the things of God, and in a "meek darkness" to will the whole trend of himself in himself to the pure and naked Being of God in God.

The divine who gave this advice did not mean that his penitent should abandon theological speculation and give himself up to devotional feelings. Nor does he intend him to enter and sustain himself in that state of prayer traditionally described in negative terms, as a *dark night*, a *ray of darkness*, a *cloud of unknowing*. These are not descriptive or evocative images, but analogies. Those who use them do not mean that the soul in prayer enters into an imaginative experience which is something like the sensuous experience of night, nor are they trying, by means of the associations of night and cloud, to stimulate the reader's awareness of the contemplative's feelings in prayer. The state they are discussing has no parallel in common experience for in it sense, reason and emotion are suspended, either deliberately, or as the result of the Christian's absorption in God. It is a *not* experiencing, an *un*knowing:

> Dessication of the world of sense,
> Evacuation of the world of fancy,
> Inoperancy of the world of spirit.

The darkness of night or of cloud are analogous to this spiritual condition, for just as physical sight is useless in the dark, so in this emptiness, memory, imagination and the other powers of the soul are blind and helpless.

None of this is exactly popular devotion and I am not recommending either *The Cloud of Unknowing* or *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* as manuals for the average Anglican. But the tradition of spiritual teaching which they represent is either undervalued or grossly sentimentalised among English churchmen and the neglect of it, like the neglect of other truths, lays Anglicans open to spiritual dangers. Few of us could sustain such a prayer, but few of us are

ignorant of a certain immobility of the heart and mind in our devotion. There are times when neither reason nor emotion is moved by the things of God. I take it that this bewildered stupidity is the *fog* of which Dom Robert Petitpierre wrote last year, and those who wander in it are not necessarily embryonic St. Johns of the Cross. This has never been an unusual state for Christians, and it is perhaps commoner now than it was because we are infected, inevitably, by the mood of a society which does not love God. A general unbelief cannot rob of us the truth which is in us, but it can and does deprive us of the *élan* of faith. This is a given condition, a common cross, but our neglect of the traditions of Christian devotion have left us ill-equipped for carrying it. Some of our assumptions even aggravate the burden. Here for instance is William Bush indignantly rejecting Dom Robert's commonplace "Just keep on praying, and don't worry about feelings." :

> "One wishes at once to reply that feelings are usually at the bottom of all important things we do in this life . . . Isn't it the prodigious capacity for feeling which makes saints saints? Wasn't it feelings which for example, prompted St. Thomas Aquinas to regard his own theological—and intellectual—masterpiece as a heap of straw?"

Well, in fact, no; but we will come back to that. The point I wish to make now is that Mr. Bush's emphasis is the normal emphasis of Anglican prayer. Feeling for us is the measure of Christian reality. Of course we do not, unless we are members of the I.V.F., expect a continual and consoling sense of God's presence. We have been warned about aridity. But we expect something, a felt pressure of the Holy Ghost directing our movements, a consciousness of that coherence and harmony which the faith teaches us to be the will of God. When, in daily life, we meet an inexplicable confusion of good and evil, and in prayer, the blank wall and the fog bank, above all when we find ourselves inert in devotion, we are badly frightened. We were not prepared for this. Saints are saints, Mr. Bush tells us, and so we have always believed, because of their capacity for feeling, and here we are, feeling nothing. Poor Cowper, once he had lost his first fervour, fell into the melancholy conviction that God had rejected him. This is an extreme, but it is the logical extreme of the position Mr. Bush takes, though, of course, his use of the word feeling is ambiguous. The experience, for instance, which made St. Thomas abandon the *Summa* was a direct apprehension of God of a kind which St. Thomas believed to be the direct gift of the Holy Spirit and *above human measure*. He allows that it was natural to man before the Fall, but even in the state of innocence the knowledge of Truth is not the function of appetites and passions (feelings) but of the intuitive intellect. But, even if we allow *feeling* to mean all intuitive knowledge, Mr. Bush's general meaning is still suspect and dangerous. All natural and supernatural gifts can and should

assist the Christian life, but holiness is not a matter of talent. It is not devotional feelings, nor good wits, nor spiritual experience which makes a saint a saint, but his continuing love of and obedience to God. Sanctity is not a state of consciousness but a state of will.

For the demand for awareness in religion is not only a poor preparation for the practicalities of the Christian life, it is untrue to the Christian relationship with God. My mediaeval divine assumed, in advising his penitent, that the union of the soul with God is not only the end and purpose of prayer, but also its ground and its beginning. He accepts a doctrine of creation which was commonplace at this period. The Benedictine Louis of Blois puts it rather more clearly than the letter writer :

> "God is rightly called the Being of every being, since his essential presence is the cause of everything continuing to exist. He is wholly in every created thing, whole and undivided in every place."

Without the presence of God, all created things would fall to annihilation and nothingness, and it follows, as St. Augustine says, that God is to be sought and found is a man's own being. It is very difficult after the Reformation and the Romantic Revival not to run to extremes about God's presence in His World, not, that is, to say "present in" and mean "identified with", so that everything in the world is thought of as a series of bubbles on a stagnant lake of divinity, or to rush into the opposite folly of supposing that God's relationship with the world is a matter of remote control. But the Gospel forbids both stupidities. Redemption, it tells us, establishes a union of grace between the Divine and the human. In Christ we are to be one with God :

> "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you."

There is no Christian life which is not lived from the life of the True Vine ; and if we are in Christ we share, then, His life with His Father. But this is not the end of the matter. First this life in Christ is not something we have by birth as human beings (F. D. Maurice thought it was, but it was Maurice's fundamental error to confuse Creation and Redemption). It belongs to those who are born of water and the Spirit. And though this supernatural life beats strongly in the rhythms of our natural existence, redeeming and glorifying the world in which we live, it is still a supernatural life, independent of the laws of finite existence. Secondly the Christian is not, and is not meant to be a passive receiver of this grace. We know what life it is that God leads in God because our Lord showed it to us in his Incarnation. It is an exchange of loving and obeying, of knowing and acting :

> "I came not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent me."

If we share that life we share in that exchange. We give, so to speak, life for life. We give back to God the only thing which it is possible for us to give, our assent to His possession of us. The Christian philosopher says there is a natural bond between the Creator and His creature, the Gospel teaches us that there is a union by grace between the Christian soul and Christ into whom we are baptised, and besides these there is a union of love between the Divine and the human will. The Christian is to be conformed to God by the continued giving of himself so that he consents to nothing but what God commands, and desires nothing but what God has willed.

This union of the will with God's Will is the end of all Christian discipline, but the pursuit of it is conditioned and especially in prayer, by the relationship which already exists between the soul and God. First, as I said, that relationship is independent of the accidents of earthly existence; nothing but sin can disturb it, and even sin cannot finally destroy it. Our feelings about it are as irrelevant as a dislike of anatomy is to the existence of our physical bodies. Secondly, though one of the ends of prayer is to know God, God is not known in the same way as we know our friends. He is not within the compass of our natural powers. Some people are tone deaf, others have no capacity for mathematics: no one has the capacity for God. What is more, God is the ground of our own being. He is not objective to us, any more than we ourselves are the objects of our own perception. We know God as we know ourselves, by reflection, and by introversion. He is reflected in Creation:

> "I kiss my hand
> To the stars, lovely asunder
> Starlight, wafting him out of it; and
> Glow, glory in thunder;
> Kiss my hand to the dappled-with-damsom west:
> Since though he is under the world's splendour and wonder,
> His mystery must be instressed, stressed."

And, He is seen in the face of the Divine Son: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father". For this reason we are taught to meditate on the life of our Lord Incarnate, to brood on the gospel story until our imagination stirs us to feelings of love. But this kind of love, this kind of reflected knowledge is, not to be irreverent, a little like the affection of Mog Edwards and Miss Price in *Under Milkwood*, a love by correspondence. It cannot satisfy for it is only a beginning, it is thinking about the Beloved, not being with Him. The servant of God, says Blosius:

> "Must believe without the slightest doubt that the invisible God is near him, yea within him . . . He should so direct himself to God shutting out the thought of all other things. He should shut himself up in God and dwell in him as in a chamber, or heaven."

In this there is a kind of blindness, as there is when we withdraw into our own selves, we have deliberately shut out all those reflections of the divine which satisfy the reason or the emotions, and direct ourselves simply to a known and yet unknown presence. We do in fact offer life for life—What I am to What You Are.

This state of prayer is not usual, though the great masters say that it is open to all Christians, but the discipline it requires is and ought to be ordinary Christian practice. To offer life for life, even in Gethsemane, or worse, in the inaneness of the last moments of Calvary when God seems not to be, is the simple ratification of the baptismal promise. This is what the writers of the negative way have to teach us; not the refusal of the human; not, certainly not, the cult of suffering which our pietist learnt from a debased Roman tradition, but the exchange of life for life, the deliberate and continuing choice of God rather than His creatures which, though we call it a negative way, is the only affirmation worth making: the assertion made in another act of prayer, not now from a mediaeval, but a modern divine.

"*O my God, My true, my only Good, my Lord, my Life, my Wine, my Bread, my Everlasting Happiness.*"

Thermodynamics, Psi and God

R. M. Appleby

One of the difficulties for scientists and technologically-minded people in approaching religion is the apparent diversity of "supernatural" or miraculous phenomena—the creation of the universe, raising the dead, changing water into wine, the gift of the Holy Spirit, etc.—requiring many different interferences with natural law.

Many preachers "play down" the miraculous. Some go to extreme lengths to "explain" the supposed events, calling upon psychology, mass hypnotism, trances and various ingenious devices such as feeding the five thousand from a cave behind Jesus which was stacked with food. This does more harm than good. It is better to recognise quite frankly that a principle other than mass energy and casuality is operating but unless this principle can be demonstrated experimentally and the wide variety of miraculous events brought down to a single class, its existence will be denied by science and the

miraculous will remain a stumbling block to scientifically-minded people. An attempt to do this has been made below.

I must ask the reader's forbearance if what I write is oversimplified for I am not a theologian, a physicist nor a psychologist. This essay should be looked upon, not as a scientific account, but as an explanation—an attempt to provide a way of looking at the natural and the supernatural in the same context. It is a possible way of thinking about religion which may be of some use to some scientists and some religious people.

Thermodynamics and entropy

The second law of thermodynamics says that, though the amount of energy in the universe remains the same, the organisation of the energy becomes more and more random with time. Thus, when a rubber ball is dropped onto a surface some of its energy of motion is converted into heat. The original energy of motion was organised in that all the atoms and molecules of the ball were moving in the same direction. The energy lost in the form of heat is degraded in that the atoms and molecules of the ball (and of the surface upon which it is bounced) increase their magnitudes of vibration in random directions, that is, entropy is increased. Eventually the ball stops bouncing and there is no remaining organised energy of motion. All the energy has been converted into heat.

If the ultimate fate of all organised energy is to become heat this means that all atoms and molecules will eventually acquire a mean temperature and the distributions of vibration directions will become random. This consequence for the universe is called the "heat death", the condition of the universe becoming asymptotic to a steady state in which all temperatures are equal.

There seems to be an interesting consequence of the theory. If the vibration of a particle (or atom or molecule) is random there is a measure of probability of it vibrating in one particular direction for an interval of time. There is a less probable chance of two particles vibrating in the same direction for the same interval of time and this may be extended so that eventually there is a measure of probability that *all* particles in the universe will vibrate in one direction. This probability is very, very small *but not an impossibility*. Similarly there is a measure of probability of *any* ordered state emerging from any other state—ordered or random. This is the same as saying that entropy may be decreased by chance but the greater the decrease the more rarely will it occur.

The probabilities involved are infinitesimally small and this is used in physics to determine which is the later of two observations of a given system, the state with the greater entropy being the later.*

* *cf.* A. Eddington, *New Pathways in Science*, C.U.P., 1944, and *The Nature of the Physical World*, C.U.P., 1944.

The probabilities are so small that those who use thermodynamics in their everyday affairs tend to drop the language of probability for that of determinism. Eddington gives a quite illogical defence of this on p.61 of the 1944 edition of his *New Pathways in Science* which consists of appeals to the emotions together with the ridiculing of those who do not adopt the views of the author. This kind of "argument" is well exposed by Thouless.*

If we accept the possibility of any ordered state emerging from any other state we have a way of looking at miracle. Miracle would be the operation of a principle other than conventional "natural" law which is capable of organising the random activity of matter in such a way that system is introduced into the situation much more frequently than chance would allow. This principle would, of necessity, operate against the second law of thermodynamics.

Can such a principle be demonstrated?

Psi phenomena

Psi phenomena† have a direct bearing on this. Two main classes of phenomena are included under this head—ESP (extra-sensory perception) and PK (psychokinesis). In a typical example of ESP an individual is asked to write down the names of the cards in a newly shuffled (that is, randomised) pack. He is kept separate from the cards so that he can in no way perceive the cards by any of his senses. The scores written down are then compared with the order of the cards in the pack, using the methods of mathematical statistics, and the deviations from the mean chance expectations are recorded. In PK, dice are rolled mechanically down a slope to fall on a surface. The individual "wills" the dice to fall in a particular way. Again, the scores are examined statistically and deviations from the mean chance expectations are recorded. The deviations are so large, in many cases, that chances of the order of a million to one against random results are indicated. For most scientists (for example, nuclear physicists) a ratio of 150 to 1 is usually taken to indicate that some systematic influence is at work—and hydrogen bombs do explode!

There are a number of controlling and other attendant factors.

First, not every person can get scores far above chance. Some never give a significant performance at all. Some start with high scores and carry on that way. In some cases high scorers have listed whole packs correctly. These observations show that we are dealing with something which is not possessed by all people in equal degree.

Second, drugs affect the scores. Small quantities of sodium

* *Straight and Crooked Thinking*, E.U.P., 1930.

† *cf.* J. B. Rhine, *The Reach of the Mind*, Penguin, 1954.

amytal or alcohol increase the scores slightly but on increasing the doses the scores decline. Caffeine restores the scoring rate. PK is more affected by the drugs than ESP.

Third, if individual trials are studied, systematic variations of scoring rates within them are often present—that is, there is a fine structure. Scores are often better at the beginning and end of a trial than in the middle. This goes with the degree of interest of the scorer, the score dropping after his initial interest and rising again when the end of this rather boring operation is in sight along with the interpretation of the results. Deliberate distraction by the experimenters also reduces scoring ability.

Fourth, there is some correlation with I.Q. People with high I.Q.s get higher scores than those with lower I.Q.s.

Fifth, relaxed people get higher scores than tensed people; expansive people do better than compressives; well balanced people are better scorers than disturbed people. Tests carried out in mental hospitals show that the ability is perfectly normal.

Sixth, those who believe that they have the ability to score well are better scorers than disbelievers.

Seventh—and one of the most interesting things about the whole business—scores are independent of space and also, to some extent, of time. The score does not correlate in any way with distance between the cards and the subject—even up to distances of thousands of miles—nor is the score brought to chance level if the score is written down first and the cards automatically shuffled later.

Finally, the process is almost entirely unconscious. The idea of what to put next just comes into the scorer's conscious mind.

Consequences

It will be noticed that all the evidence is of the kind where order is brought out of disorder. In the ESP example, cards are automatically put into a disordered sequence and the scorer writes down scores which agree with the sequence of the cards in an orderly way. The best scores have been faithful reproductions of the orders of the cards. Similarly, in PK experiments, order appears where there should have been random arrangements of the faces of the dice. Psi ability seems to be the ability to bring order into what should be random things, that is the faces of the dice and the orders on the lists. Yet the sequence of events in both kinds of cases is without material cause. Material cause is deliberately excluded in the experimental design. This points inevitably to the conclusion that a decrease of entropy has occurred. Since the occurrence is without material cause it cannot have occurred at the expense of an increase of entropy elsewhere. The frequencies with which the events occur eliminate chance decreases of entropy so we are thrown back on one explana-

tion only and that is that systematic non-causal decreases of entropy occur in these experiments.

The ease with which scoring and randomising the cards can be transposed in time without reducing the scores compels us to think of the decreases as, to some extent, independent of the time dimension.*

The fact that the dice can be organised without the passage of energy while pure inter-person ESP can occur indicates that the system is present "outside" as well as "inside" people.

The correlation of Psi scores with "higher" psychological functions does not necessarily mean that the scores are produced by our psychology. If psychology is the function in terms of matter and energy of nerve cells then the decrease of entropy is certainly not produced by the cells for the principle, however it works, is independent of space and time and, hence, probably also of matter and energy. No, the recognition of a fourth principle is a necessary step to take and if the step is taken it must be recognised that the behaviour of a particle or atom or molecule is as naturally dependent upon this principle as upon known physical "law", however slight the effects of the principle may be in most cases.

We have thus generalised from the Psi experiments to matter and energy as a whole. If this is valid, we are in a position to suppose that matter and energy can become more organised more frequently than chance would allow. We have thus gone some way towards demonstrating a principle in the universe other than mass, energy and causality.

What are the limits of the principle? PK has only been demonstrated in macroscopic processes, such as influencing the fall of dice. It would be interesting to know if PK could affect nuclear processes. A possible means of doing this is to hand in the scintillation counter with which individual nuclear disintegrations can be detected. Similarly, experiments using Brownian movement could be devised to establish whether or not the principle could operate on particles capable of being observed while being buffeted by atoms and small molecules. If this is so the principle is potentially important in gene mutation which is looked upon as structural change in a large molecule. Random gene mutation is regarded as partly due to random movement in the fluids containing the genes as E. Schrödinger showed.† If we should recognise that the fourth principle can act on gene mutation we would be forced to recognise the possibility that evolution itself may be, in part, governed by the principle. PK effects could be sought in the breeding experiments of geneticists.

Moving into more complex fields we know that the activity of the brain in man contains elements of this kind. If free will is a reality

* *cf.* C. G. Jung and W. Pauli, *Interpretation of nature and the Psyche*, English Edition, 1955.

† *What is life?*, C.U.P., 1951.

it can only occur when all the factors influencing a decision in one direction are equal to all the factors influencing in the other. Under these circumstances random activity in a single cell *may* be the "deciding" factor and, if Psi decreases of entropy occur here, they would be the deciding factor acting, possibly, on a system in unstable equilibrium.

I mentioned above that the ESP scorers are rarely conscious of what they are going to put next. The idea just comes into their heads. This may be evidence that some ideas, inspiration and creative activity are of Psi origin and this is important for man, more than any other species, is capable of acting in a mass way on initiative which springs from one individual.

If, as most psychologists seem to think, the behaviour of man is to a great extent conditioned by past experiences, on the one hand, and the inherited anatomy and physiology on the other, the area left for free will is small. Yet we are so capable of taking training that, even if the decisions involving genuine free will are small, provided they are always taken in the direction of one object (for example to be in accordance with a system of ethics) this small but steady pressure may be capable of displacing the whole psyche to another centre. If, now, we postulate the steady operation of Psi effects within the area of "free choice" we have a potentially important source which would be capable of influencing the behaviour of people over their lifetimes, perhaps of civilisations over the centuries and mankind over geological time.

In view of the above considerations, it may well be that *all* process in nature results from interactions of matter and energy in normal statistical physical relationship, together with a proportion of Psi activity. Partial verification of this hypothesis could be attempted through PK attempts on (a) nuclear disintegration using scintillation counters, (b) Brownian movement, and (c) breeding experiments.

Some consequences for religion

Psi activities prove that a principle other than matter, energy and causality is at work in the universe. This demolishes one of the main professed obstacles to religious belief among determinists for now nothing, including miracle, is impossible.

The independence of the ESP phenomena of time supports the idea that there are timeless things at work in the universe.

The connection of the fine structure of Psi phenomena with "higher" psychological functions, such as interest, allow us to interpret liturgical practice in terms of improving the conditions for ESP and not just in terms of suggestion and autosuggestion.

The ability to get good scores of what is yet to be, is evidence that

at least some part of the human psyche is to some extent independent of time and hence of the death of the body, which is a point in time.* In other words there is at least *some* life after death.

Correlation of Psi abilities with intelligence (I.Q.), which is largely determined by heredity† might suggest that not all people are able to communicate as well by ESP. This may mean that they are naturally less "spiritual" people. It also gives a useful criterion for identifying those who might be expected, under favourable circumstances, to make use of spiritual gifts. The mystics of the church were and are a highly intelligent body of men and women.‡ I suppose I ought to make it clear that I do *not* mean that we should therefore ignore our brothers and sisters with lower I.Q.s. It is the nature of Psi phenomena that they break all our rules. All I am suggesting is that the correlation might be *one* useful tool if it should ever become desirable to select for Psi activity.

The same thing goes for relaxed, expansive, well-balanced people. It follows, therefore, that the church would do well to make use of medical psychiatry to help their neurotic parishioners to achieve that well-balanced normal condition in which Psi activity appears most frequently. A psychiatrist does not have to be a Christian to do this—nor do psychiatrists seek to destroy their patients' religion. All the priest has to do is send the sufferer to a *good* psychiatrist.

So far, the words "God", "Creation", "Love", etc., have not been mentioned. It is possible to equate the fourth principle with God for some physicists believe that a reversal of entropy on a universal scale may have been the immediate cause of the dense sphere of energy known as Lemaitre's Atom, from which the universe, as we know it today, has evolved. God would therefore be at work at the beginning—at the Creation—and under these terms the fourth principle is transcendental. The fourth principle at work in individuals is one of its immanent aspects. It pervades all natural law and has thus been creating through all time and continues to do so. By "leaning" on the innumerable decisions made by individuals (Grace), Agape may be allowed to grow in the world.

Wrong choice, which is a consequence of free choice, equates with the Fall. The withdrawal of communication may mean that the wrong choice is a result of undirected random activity in the one cell which "tips the scale". Whatever the nature of the Fall, the remedy is immediately available when *genuine* communication is made with the fourth principle. Interest (genuineness) cannot be faked so communication is reduced unless there is fundamental

* Jung and Pauli, *op. cit.* This came out in Jung's television interview *Face to Face* with John Freeman last year, as well as in his *Personal Communication* widely published over here earlier this year.

† R. Knight, *Intelligence and Intelligence Testing*, Methuen, 1950. C. Burt and M. Howard, The multifacturial theory of inheritance and its application to intelligence, 1956. *Brit. Jour. Statist. Psychol*, 9 : 95—131.

‡ E. Underhill, *The Mystics of the Church*, London.

belief, that is, Faith. The object of communication can be equated with the Holy Spirit—thus providing a way of thinking about the Triune personality.

Psi activity is largely unconscious. The actual communication occurs at some deeply unconscious level and "bubbles up" into the conscious mind, becoming clothed with other contents on the way up.* Repressed information would become attached and psychopathic contents could distort the basic information. This may provide light on the relationship between religion, ethics and psychopathology.

There are many ramifications of this hypothesis but sufficient has been given to indicate the general trend. The main conclusion is that if a person is to be both a scientist and religious he must evolve an approach which does not do violence to either science or religion. This essay is an attempt to do this.

Comment

Recent events in the Congo have provided satisfaction in some quarters, those quarters in fact which have always disliked—openly or secretly—the attitudes and actions of the Mirfield fathers in Africa and those missionaries and others who discovered to their delight that Africans tended to be congenial and charming company. "We told you so," they are now saying, even in such august places as the correspondence columns of *The Times*, "We told you all Africans were savages and if you give them independence the whole continent will show a regression to stone-age civilisation. What about the Belgian women raped and children molested?" Etc., etc. Now it is surely very important that this attitude should be fully dealt with. The Belgians themselves have, of course, been proved catastrophically wrong in their thinking: "*pas d'élites, pas d'ennuis*" (no educated Africans, no tiresome problems) and nobody has stayed to deny this. But strength seems somehow to have been added to those who think that the process of learning how to be independent must be a slow one as well as to those who remain convinced that all black men are cannibals if you give them half a chance. These two attitudes—one rational and one totally irrational—tend to get absorbed in one another so that while you may find yourself talking one moment about the necessity of education before self-government, the next moment you have to cope with raving about blood and sex.

* G. W. Balfour, in a study of psychological aspects of Mrs. Willett's mediumship and the statements of the communicators concerning process. *Proc. S.P.R.* 42.

Those of us who feel our position less secure than it was have got to do two things. The first is to distinguish between the different problems of various parts of Africa and to insist, what few could deny since Freud, that education and environment are the determining factors in any individual or group and that inherited racial tendencies, which without environmental factors can continue potent for long periods, are soon not merely glossed over or lost to sight until the next moment for atavism shows up, but are actually adapted and enter the racial process through children and grandchildren as different, or as we would say more civilised, racial characteristics. The other (for this is not much more than a point of argument) is more important. Since the war public opinion, led by Fathers Scott and Huddleston and the rest of the cloud of witnesses, has been brought to see that the African in the Union is disgracefully exploited and oppressed by a dominant white minority. The effect of this is two-fold—first it tends to generate an uncritical admiration for all things black and second it produces (*experto credite*) a warm glow of righteous anger at all white men in South Africa. Both these effects are dangerous : the second because the command to love all men must include the necessity of loving the *petite bourgeoise* housewife just out from Leeds who screams abuse at her maid with all the unconscious satisfaction of one who has never been allowed to scream abuse at anyone before in her life. We must love whites as well as blacks. For those of us who have got over the compulsion to hate blacks it is easier to love them if we hate their white oppressors. And this is not yet Christianity.

Secondly and by the same token we must not glamourise or romanticise the merits of black people, for this does neither them nor their cause any good. It is only when we can regard them as people—to be criticised as well as appreciated, to be quarrelled with as well as laughed with, to be done favours by as well as to do favours to—it is only, in fact when they cease to be "they"—that the full process of identification has been accomplished and both white people and black people may at last become adult.

The particular application of this is clear enough. In the next ten years there is likely to be a violent revulsion from indigenous African people as country after country tackle in their varyingly adequate ways the problems of self-government. The growing liberalism which was beginning to erode the deep unconscious prejudices of racism may well falter as new black ruling élites make it clear that white minorities are not the only people who know how to oppress. In such a situation it is no good pretending that these things are not happening, or that they are solely the fault of the white intruders who failed to prepare the indigenous peoples for the moment when they decided there was nothing more to be gained by their remaining in Africa. It is no good concentrating exclusively on those parts of the continent which still contain an unpleasant white minority to campaign against and to thwart. Without

education, atavism in Africa is inevitable. With education, a black élite is still not necessarily better than a white élite, though not necessarily worse either. It is vital for ourselves, for the future of Africa and for the advancement of adult attitudes to race in every continent, for those who have led the honourable and Christian way in fighting the oppressive régime of the whites in Southern Africa, now and in the future to lead the way to a fuller understanding of the irrelevance of race—which means that just as black people are as good as white people, so white people are as good as black people. And when we begin to accept this we both grow up ourselves and permit others of other races to grow up too.

* * * *

Poverty is after all necessarily the obsession of the natives in emergent nations; and they only turn to politics as they have been doing in the Congo as an immature quick route to plenty and to status. We have lots of correspondents to remind us of African turmoil. One which doesn't is the Northern Rhodesia Cathedral Appeal newsletter, whose latest issue manages completely to ignore the surrounding ferment. It is touching to think of this as other-worldly faith that overlooks passing disturbances. It is difficult not to call it escapism.

* * * *

This thought arises in the context of visiting some London churches. It is so much easier to pray in a church than at home. Yet if you go to St. Paul's, Onslow Square, and ring the verger's bell at the end of the passage for admission to the church, you're unlikely to find him at home. So you trot off to St. Peter's, Cranley Gardens (knowing it's Central) to see a notice saying the north door is always open in daylight and a rusting padlock on the gate to it. At St. Barnabas, Pimlico, musty Butterfield fane, the caretaker rushes to tell you there's no right of way when you pass through the yard to the church. St. Michael's, Chester Square, opens up for slick smooth weddings. If we are told this is carping we'll give a list of friendly open churches, where sad or successful parish priests greet you (with surprise or bonhomie respectively). They rarely leave you alone. What are all these great churches of ours for if they aren't there to help us to pray? Compare, for devotion and non-interference, the two R.C. churches in Kingsway and Covent Garden: and, for that matter, any number of C. of E. ones, Low as well as High. For four-star recommendations, see next month's *Prism*.

* * * *

August is the month when clergymen, like their flocks, go on holiday. It is the time when lay readers come into their own. I have read or sung the Office in seven different churches in the last

few weeks. It is very nice, for one is welcomed everywhere, even in one tiny church where the congregation consisted of the organist and caretaker. There, after the Office was over we all felt a comforting glow, not merely of duty done, but of having taken part in the whole prayer of the Church—an aspect of the Anglican Office often overlooked when the congregation is large enough to be self-sufficient. The caretaker consoled us by telling us the story of a woman who went to a crowded church : her husband had just died but no-one consoled her or gave her a cup of tea so she committed suicide—which showed that numbers didn't mean a thing. I didn't point out a logical fallacy in this deduction. The warm feeling of satisfaction after friendly goodbyes have been said ("A change is as good as a rest" more than one churchwarden said after the new preacher's sermon) needs to be watched. After all we have none of the sweating anxiety about failing numbers and deteriorating fabrics, rows in the congregation, no responsibility in fact, for the continual refreshing of the church life of the community. We come and we go, affable and gratified. But the real reward, as the real suffering, belongs to others.

* * * *

A friend recently went into a London cathedral one evening intent on making his confession. Heartened by the notice outside which told him he was there at the right moment, he edged his way past the usual suspicious verger towards a far corner where he could see a penitent busy confessing. He looked for somewhere to wait, and took a seat on a bench in sight but out of earshot. Soon the verger stalked him. "You can't sit there, go to the chapel round the corner." "But . . ." and he explained his point. "You go into that chapel and I'll tell him you're here." Round he went, tucked away there awaiting his summons ; six, seven, eight, nine, ten minutes and no call. Impatience got the better of him, and he went to see what was happening, only to find the priest disrobing in the vestry and gossiping with the verger. Our friend explained his predicament. "Next time you'd better make an appointment," was the priest's curt comment ; and he continued with his chat.

* * * *

Two promising new publishing projects are at the moment under active consideration. The first is *Prism's Guide to Ecclesiastical Jargon.* Entries, with short descriptive comments and examples of use will be welcomed and may well be published, without royalty payment. The other, arising from last month's number on church-manship, is a short study, simply entitled *How to Embarass your High/Low Church Friends/Enemies* (delete the inapplicable words, of course). A good way of embarrassing the passing sophisticated high church parson (the phrase is deliberate) is to insist on his joining in the family sung grace (it is necessary for the family to

join in as well, in order to get the full flavour of this gambit). This can be countered, if you are a monk, by talking learnedly about the latest American musicals, which flummoxes low churchmen and women. If you go out to lunch on a Friday with an Evangelical priest (refer him to 1662 if he queries the word), insist on a glass of champagne with your fish. He will be equally insistent on tomato juice with his steak pie. Then talk exclusively of ecumenical matters. ("I always think this business of churchmanship is a lot of nonsense, don't you?") Central churchmen are the most self-conscious over behaviour and can be observed scratching their chests discreetly before meals if they are in the company of known high-churchmen who, however, often appear to give themselves dispensation from all acknowledgements of the deity at such times, presumably if they judge the company to be sufficiently ungodly. It is quite difficult to get monks to say grace; some adjust this to the suspected churchmanship of the family and one went into sharp reverse in the space of two meals after what he must have felt to be a chilly reception of his first somewhat ornate liturgical exercise. The safest guide seems to be, don't be self-conscious, and when in doubt do what you normally do, not what you think the present company is used to. Children have no self-consciousness about such things, and tend to regard as God the last clergymen who was kind to them, provided of course that he was dressed in a cassock. One wonders where they got this idea from. The nicest thing that happened to ours was to be blessed, while sleeping, by the local suffragan, whose own children demand a blessing, followed by a brisk bit of back-scratching, each night before retiring. Blessings, in fact, seem far too rare, and saying grace, which is only a special instance of the generic activity, has usurped the whole field. I think if priests threw blessings round more indiscrimately—when entering buses, houses, cafés, factories and perhaps lavatories, for instance, we should all be the better for it.

Arguments and Experience

Christian Stewardship Again

Of the 500 English parishes (less than 5%) which have completed planned giving campaigns, 55% report that the general effects on Church Life have been "slight or not observable". Moreover, certain methods can be destructive. Tricks, for instance, like

setting members in competition, using the generous gift of one to shame the others into giving more—such methods may work once or twice, but are they worth the ultimate cost? How about those who are angered, embarrassed or disillusioned? A parish or diocese is only as strong as its fellowship: it is worth more than a few quick pounds.

The fact is that the English scene lacks an explicit theology of Stewardship. I suggest this from three convictions: (1) the best books on Stewardship are still from overseas, and then not from Anglicans. (2) Already the work of salvaging Stewardship schemes has become a necessity because "know-why" and "know-how" have not gone hand in hand. Often the need today is to slow down or steady diocesan and parish action until schemes can be grounded in spiritual growth and Biblical theology. (3) The few actively engaged in Stewardship are swamped and have too little opportunity to reflect and co-ordinate. I doubt if a small sub-department of the CBF can in fact keep abreast of what is going on and give adequate theological expression to it. In each of these spheres the Devil is busy, hardening hearts, creating tensions, urging "busyness".

Something is wrong. There is not enough theological thinking about Stewardship. Too many questions go unanswered. Theology cannot remain indifferent to such widespread activity, in which the Christian faith is expressing itself. Stewardship teaching should never include anything which is not theologically sound, even if it promises to be temporarily effective in the raising of money. At the latest CBF Annual Conference one of the main speakers stated that

> "the purpose of Stewardship is to get people to see the need to give money to the Church".

None of the "experts" challenged him. Surely the main object of Stewardship is to point men to Christ, not to raise money.

The purpose of this discussion is to underline this object and to consider the role of theological enquiry. In the words of Bishop Lilje,

> "our systematic theologians must show us how the theology of justification by faith is completed in the practical sphere by a theology of Stewardship."

There are no short-cuts. Pioneering is inevitably more of a spiral than a straight line or neat pattern. Somehow we have to get back to the true theology behind Stewardship, and also to get beyond what the national press reports in terms of "new ways of balancing the parish budget". The doctrine of Stewardship is not new, but it has been neglected. Would it have been neglected if Anglican theology had expounded the whole Gospel as a living faith? "The need of the giver to give" was a New Testament truth long before it became a professional slogan. It is amazing that out of the

"rediscovery" of the Gospel at the Reformation the principles and methods of Christian Giving were not forthcoming. It is equally amazing today that among the first parishes in this country to need professional help in fund-raising were those which had already come alive and were in action. A well-known rural dean was outlining most impressive plans for a deanery teaching week this autumn. When I asked him about Stewardship, I was told,

> "we are deliberately keeping money and Stewardship right out of it and concentrating on teaching people how to live the Christian life".

I cannot write from fifty years of pastoral experience or theological reflection, but I doubt if these would enable me to accept such views, which are widespread at many levels of Church life today.

MANY ARE TIRED OF THIS WORD Stewardship. It is becoming unpopular. Why all the fuss? After all the price the church has already paid for this neglect is a high one. It can be counted in hundreds and thousands of "tips" to God from well-meaning people who have never been confronted with the truly spiritual, truly Christian reasons for giving. These people have not meant to be stingy. They have done what the church has asked them to do, by giving to timidly conceived budgets. While the price the church has paid in terms of "lost pounds" is important and perhaps even measurable, the price it has paid in "lost influence" in the lives of the givers themselves is more tragic and beyond measuring. And this devastation is spreading. The National Marriage Guidance Council testifies how much tragedy could be averted if only folk were taught a responsible use of possessions.

There are dangers in such teaching. On the one hand we must beware of regarding Stewardship as an optional extra. There is no such thing as a self-made man. Speaking theologically, Stewardship has to do with a man's place in life, his relationship to God, to things and to all of life. It has to do with our use of things and the orientation of the whole of our lives. Christian Stewardship reminds us that all of this world is God's, and our role is to serve Him. The New Testament uses the word Steward many times. The Greek word means "one who orders a household", but with the further meaning that this household belongs to someone else. The Steward must manage that which is committed to his care according to the general wishes of his owner, and also he must obviously make his plans for the furtherance of the owner's interests. He must therefore be, as Our Lord says, both faithful and wise. No one can be a Christian steward until led into the presence of One whose service is perfect freedom, and until a genuine commitment to the Master has taken place. Then we become sons and heirs, receivers and givers, not merely trustees and servants. The opposite danger is to regard Stewardship as the Church's one foundation. The strongest

incentive to Christian Stewardship is the realisation: Christ died for me. Our greatest Stewardship is the Stewardship of the Gospel. We do not have to bargain with God. We love only because He first loved us.

Perhaps Stewardship is the sword of the Spirit. Certainly it is dividing the faithful from those who want to play with religion. The Book of Common Prayer is full of the dichotomy between living for Christ and nominal allegiance, and the Stewardship inherent in our Anglican worship has not been absorbed by the living Church because of the failure of theologians and parish priests to recognise this fact; we have failed to draw out "the things which may please Him at this present" into a compelling faith. Stewardship *is* the due sense of all His mercies, so that our hearts may be unfeignedly thankful and that we,

> "shew forth His praise not only with our lips, but in our lives; by giving up ourselves to His service and by walking before Him in holiness and righteousness all our days."

At the beginning of every Celebration, the Collect for Stewardship is recited:

> "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known and from whom no secrets are hid . . ."

Likewise the Prayer for the Church Militant, the emphasis throughout being on the *true* religion which we may hear *and receive*. The Collects at Mattins and Evensong, for example, are petitions that our stewardship may be faithful and acceptable. I suggest that the most effective way to enable all this new activity to be rooted in Biblical theology and spiritual growth is to go through the Book of Common Prayer and uncover its theology of Stewardship.

> "Here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee,"

is the deepening of the sacramental life to which Stewardship is pointing.

SO OFTEN STEWARDSHIP SCHEMES GO AGROUND precisely because there is no theology. The expression "planned giving" for instance, is dangerous and is doing harm. It is quite possible for giving to be systematic without being sacrificial. The commercial concerns set a target which is nice and low, so that parishes can reach it without getting anywhere near *sacrificial* giving. The delighted clients are often applauding themselves for "planned meanness". "It's all right for you, vicar, you get £700 a year. What about me? I only get £30 a week." And we encourage it time and again. How the Devil tempts parishes with this great concern for money. Improving

their own facilities is the top priority year after year; they don't want "budgets of opportunity".

The expression "do-it-yourself" is equally misleading, implying a cheap and leisurely amateurism. This is not necessarily so; it may be a case of doing what God intends His family to do, themselves translating the Gospel into parish life. There is a Stewardship of opportunity. One might repudiate the professional slogan that "there is no substitute for experience" by discovering that faith is a very adequate alternative. Can anyone imagine the New Testament Church going cap in hand to professional consultants—"We are defeated; we cannot manage our Christian calling; we cannot work and pray out our own Stewardship in Christ, so we want to pay you to tell us what we should be doing already."

It is good for the diocese to direct its own campaigns, and I am sorry that this is not the "official" view. It is not true that they are less efficient, though it is usually left to the companies to advertise satisfied clients. The "record" for a Church in the London area is *not* held by the fund-raisers. Yet CBF statistics show that parishes are becoming more self-centred than a few years ago. Missionary giving is less and less in proportion. Put briefly, the motive for target-raising is the inadequate parish budget—we must give to maintain and improve our own facilities. The motive for Christian Giving is sacrificial gratitude to God—

> "Not for the hope of gaining aught,
> Not seeking a reward,
> But as Thyself hast loved me,
> O ever loving Lord."

THEOLOGY CAN RESCUE other trends. The Lord's business needs, and certainly deserves, as much energy, imagination and planning as secular business. It is not something to be done in a few spare moments by people who will only give a lackadasical interest to it. We are not stewards for ourselves, we are acting for God. There is too much superficial literature about "ten easy steps to painless giving" or "read this and you have 'done' Stewardship". Where are the calls to prayer, the aids to Bible study, the guides for discussion groups? Where is effective theology when we have to raise money to keep the Church open, and to keep the Church open to raise money? What has been happening in theology to allow parish life to be supported/distorted by jumble sales and raffles and other sub-Christians gimmicks? Where was the call to get on with spreading the Gospel? We have left undone those things which we ought to have done in hundreds of parishes over hundreds of years. Folk cannot follow a lead which is not given. These things need working out. The idea that this is a layman's job is a dangerous half-truth, ignoring the pastoral and spiritual responsibilities of the clergy.

Among the most perplexing questions are the "reward" for

giving, and the identity of the giver. We can get started on some of the answers. No "expert" challenged the theology of a recent article in a Stewardship magazine listing,

> "the most successful business men who had risen to fortune and fame as a result of honouring God with their substance".

Not for the hope of gaining aught? Which do we believe? We turn again to the New Testament. "What shall be have therefor?" Grace is the eternally promised reward; everything else has to be left to God. Bishop Stephen Neill bids us meditate on the Penitent Thief.

> "Thou shalt be with me," said Jesus,

neither releasing himself nor this fellow-sufferer from his cross. The Penitent Thief was blessed in his asking, but his situation was not mitigated; he was not set free from his cross.

> "Not as the world gives, give I unto you."

Instead of teaching people what rewards our Stewardship brings, we would do well to reflect with the Psalmist,

> "What reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the benefits that he hath done unto me?"

There is confusion about the identity of the giver. To whom shall we go? Do we canvass the faithful, or do we ask all residents to pay for their parish church? The questions behind this confusion are again theological. What is the Church? What is its message? Many schemes for parish action forget that God put His Church into the world not to bring money to itself but to bring men to Him. With the help of theological insights we may discover that Stewardship *is* evangelism in two stages; first, an educational campaign to commit Church members themselves to abolish the constant parade of trivialities which the typical parish programme offers to the public; secondly, a missionary campaign to win others to this living faith, in which Stewardship is proclaimed as the norm for Christians. At the recent CBF Conference this was stated the wrong way round —first, beg from the outsider and then try to get him interested. Theology can help to get the priorities right. It may take years to promote evangelism in these two stages and, in any case, the teaching and practice of Stewardship has to go on all the year round, every year. It has no season, but goes on all the time so that folk absorb and understand it as basic Christianity, a part of spiritual growth, and not just a trick brought out at the last minute to raise money. Perhaps this would be more obvious if the Church created a Department of Christian Stewardship instead of the present subsection of the Central Board *of Finance*!

Brian Rice

A Letter to Mr. Darton

Dear Mr. Darton,

What a lot of questions about Christian Stewardship you asked your Vicar two months ago, through the medium of *Prism*! You may have had some good answers from him. But since your impression of a planned giving campaign is contrary to that of a very large number of people who have taken part in campaigns elsewhere, I am sure you will not mind my using the same medium to suggest some answers to your four main questions. They are mostly quotations, for I cannot claim powers of original writing; but it is my job to know what other people are writing in this field.

(1) "*What* is *Christian Stewardship*?" Resolution 64 of the Lambeth Conference is a good starting-point:

> "The Conference recalls Church people to the duty and privilege of stewardship, of which sacrificial, planned, and systematic giving is a part, to the end that the souls of the people may be enriched, and the needs of the Church met".

Again to quote from the Bishops' Encyclical Letter:

> "There can be no forward steps without a full acceptance of Christian stewardship. By stewardship we mean the regarding of ourselves—our time, our talents, and our money—as a trust from God to be utilized in His service".

Before your parish embarked on its campaign your Vicar and some leading laity had probably read *The Christian Stewardship of Money*. In the light of all that is written in that book, it is sad that you should imagine that the sole purpose of your campaign was "to give more money to the church". That is poles apart from our statement:

> "If Christian stewardship is taught merely as a means of raising money for the Church, it will fail. If it is taught with single-minded emphasis upon the accountability of the faithful steward to God for the right use of all with which God has entrusted him, the needs of the Church will look after themselves".

Have you and your Vicar come across Mr. Hunter Johnston's booklet, *Money in Christian Life*? It is still the best outline of the principles underlying the Christian stewardship movement that I have read.

Oddly enough, the very number of *Prism* that contained your letter had a wonderful answer to your first question. Sister Edna

Mary, in the course of her inspiring article *Praying and Working*, wrote:

"God permits us to offer to Him, consciously and deliberately, a part of our life in token that the whole is His, that we exercise it in stewardship for Him, and that we are ready to surrender whatever else He may ask, even the whole. When we offer part of something to God, that part does not stand in opposition to the remainder which we keep for ourselves, but it represents the whole and in so doing expresses the consecration of the whole to the Giver. That is true of our material possessions."

(2) "*Where in the New Testament do you find anything to say that Christians should husband their properties prudently as a trust held for God?*" This has to some extent already been answered. But let me refer you to *Stewardship in the New Testament Church* by Holmes Rolston, an American Presbyterian Minister. (O that some of our leading Church of England theologians would get down to some proper thinking and writing in this field!) Chapter Two, *The Teachings of Jesus concerning stewardship of possessions*, is particularly relevant, and contains passages about the Rich Fool, and the Rich Young Ruler too.

(3) "*Why do we want a businessman from outside the parish to come and tell us our duty?*"

"If English Church people need to be taught the principles of Christian stewardship—as they do—and if the Church in this land lacks men trained to teach this subject—as it does—we should be sufficiently humble to accept the help which the fund-raising companies offer . . . But, to the greatest extent possible, and as soon as possible, the Church should provide such services for itself".*

(4) "*What on earth has happened to the Church if, in order to find the appearance of fellowship, it has to go to a pub for it?*" Is the normal Church of England congregation notable for its fellowship, and its friendliness to newcomers and "fringers"? I do not think that the followers of a Master who with His disciples sat down at meat with many publicans and sinners need be ashamed of taking part in a Campaign Dinner at a pub—or, as is more normal, in a marquee or the largest dance-hall or works canteen in the neighbourhood. And if at that dinner a speaker puts across a vision of the world-wide Church, some of the listeners with "fridges full of food at home" may see more clearly the duty of "sacrificial, planned, and systematic giving".

The Bishop of Southwell, writing to the people of his diocese a month ago, summarised our task:

"The mission of the Church to our affluent society is to redeem and sanctify its wealth".

* *Christian Stewardship of Money*, p. 58.

Do you commend the methods of some of his flock who, faced with a bill for £860 for repairing damage caused by the death-watch beetle in their church, are reported to have been "raising money by selling hot-dogs in the street outside"? Personally, I prefer direct planned giving.

Yours sincerely,

W. H. Saumary Smith

An Ordinand in Industry

No sooner had I got more or less settled down, than a sudden recurrence of recession caused the management to shut down one of our furnaces. It was a case of last in first out. I was moved to the gas-producer for the siemen's ('B') furnace. I worked there only for a fortnight, in the place of a man who was off sick. The plant consisted of a large hopper which, every ten minutes or so, had to be filled with coal. There were two men on the job, one of whom threw the coal out of a waggon and the other threw it into the hopper. We worked three shifts (6—2, 2—10, 10—6). It was a fairly strenuous job and there was not much rest; though on the afternoon shift I had half-an-hour in which to go out to the pub and fetch some beer for my mate and also have a pint myself . . .

I was soon aware that within this group no-one had a private life, in the sense that a professional man may be said to have. A day would often begin by somebody recounting a detail (sometimes an intimate detail) of his home-life. We all knew about the woman who lived next door to one of the crane-drivers who never bought her own cigarettes; or about the successful way a man had adjusted his television set by fixing magnets on the back, etc., etc. We knew, and discussed, each other's taste in food, clothes, music, TV programmes, films and so on. There was little odd behaviour that could pass without comment. What was remarkable, however, was the tolerance and fundamental respect for personality which was basic to this frank speaking. There was no gossip. You could say what you liked, provided you said it "straight", and were prepared to get a straight answer. It was useless to try to get on with a person by attempting to "find a formula". You had to be yourself and give yourself. This is sociability at its deepest level and, in my opinion, at its most satisfying. To the outsider the ways in which it finds expression may seem trivial, comic, or obscene; its full meaning can only be felt within the day-to-day activity of a small group.

Michael Routh

Bernard Williams's Image: A Reply

The Theological Appearance of the Church of England, which Bernard Williams wrote in the June issue of *Prism* contained much intelligent and stimulating criticism of Anglicanism. He was quite right to say that the Church must speak to those outside itself as well as conducting its own internal conversations and I hope that some of the following comments on his article will be intelligible to the interested non-believer.

He suggests that there is difficulty in identifying an Anglican position. For the superficial enquirer, definitions may at first appear elusive. But an approach to other Christian churches will not necessarily prove any more straightforward. The Society of Friends is an obvious example: but even where there do exist handy collections of dogmatic statements, startling variations of interpretation can be found. Methodists have "High" and "Low", and Bernard Williams must be aware that Roman Catholic theologians differ amongst themselves in the emphasis they place on aspects of the relationship of Man to God.

In fact, a statement about the nature of the Anglican Church which, in an effort to achieve both precision and comprehensiveness, concentrates on the extreme positions which can be found among Anglicans, is misleading simply because in relation to Anglicans in general the number of people adopting these positions is marginal. A true description of the Anglican Church must be largely concerned with the main-stream traditions of the Church.

Bernard Williams suggests that within the Church of England there is no "central body of beliefs common to all". This is a case in point of the sort of statement which I have just referred to. It is quite true that there is no single tenet of the Church of which one can say that it is certainly accepted without reservation by every individual Anglican. But here one is dealing with a marginally precise definition which is useless for practical purposes. There is, indeed, a central corpus of belief which is accepted by the vast majority of Anglicans.

But he objects (if I understand him correctly) that it is difficult, if not impossible, to find out what this core of belief is and draws a contrast in this respect with the Roman Catholic Church. I am sympathetic with his difficulty. It is important, however, to understand that Anglican beliefs are a living whole based on the Scriptures but nourished by the fruitful interaction of the principle traditions of Christianity existing together within the Church of England. These beliefs are coherent and could in principle be defined. But to be of use to Christians and non-Christians a definition of Anglican beliefs would have to be completely and perfectly true.

Since this would have to be produced by men (who are fallible) using words (which are imprecise) the help of the Holy Ghost must

be assumed. Without the help of the Holy Ghost, one must equally assume that the definition which would emerge would be imprecise and distorted and therefore in the last analysis untrue. We are not forced to attempt this definition. It *is* possible, even for the sophisticated enquirer, to find out the nature of Anglican beliefs without it. To try therefore to arrive at a definition knowing that without the help of the Holy Ghost one is doomed to failure is to put God to the test just as much as is the man who jumps off a cliff, assuming that God will save him in mid-air. This is not an argument against attempting theological definitions. For most purposes theological definitions can be of considerable use without being perfect.

If only because Bernard Williams has made the comparison with the Roman Catholic Church, it may be worth pointing out that some of the time spent by intelligent Catholics in defence of their faith will in point of fact be taken up in explaining away the oversimplifications inherent in the precise and compact definitions of their catechism. He has also had unfortunate experience of Anglican clergy, and finds them theologically uneducated compared with Catholic priests. I know of many Anglican priests who are fully convinced of the fundamental relationship between sound theological thinking and Christian social morality: and experience of Catholic priests in the provinces does not always confirm his good opinions. But in any case the particular argument seems irrelevant to the general one about the claims of the Church of England.

He goes on to discuss two points which he feels have not adequately been considered by Anglicans. In the first he poses the question: which is more important, to save the body or the soul? The dichotomy is, however, foreign both to contemporary psychological theory and to orthodox catholic Christian thought. The doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body implies without question that body and soul are one, and in this context attempts to define levels of priority are both fruitless and dangerous.

He next criticizes in general the inadequacy of Anglican moral theology. To the extent that criticisms of this sort from intelligent men outside the Church are justified one must, of course, hope that they will evoke greater activity in this field. But his final point seems unnecessary. That is, that the arguments of the Church of England for the existence of God are peculiarly vulnerable to the advance of scientific knowledge, and in this respect, again, compare unfavourably with those relied on by the Church of Rome. There are two points to be made here. To the extent that an argument for the existence of God relies on empirical data which can be shown to be false, the argument is thereby shown to be irrelevant. But if an argument which relies purely on logical or metaphysical assumptions can be shown to be inconclusive, it is equally irrelevant. And, in fact, if God exists, it matters little what arguments there are for his existence—and equally if He does not.

But Bernard Williams is right to believe that "no arguments . . . .

will prove this conclusion", since it is of the nature of the statement "God exists" that it cannot be proved either empirically or logically. He is saying "Please give me a good argument to convince me that God exists". Nobody can. Nobody has ever been *argued* into believing in God. All must make the final leap in the dark. Faith is the knock-down argument.

Gina Alexander

A Plea for Specialists

To some readers of *Prism* the word "specialist" evidently represents just another of the reprehensible crazes which are sidetracking the Church ; others use the word as a badge to assure their fellow-clergy that they are not as other men. Whether used with approval, tolerance or distaste, the word "specialist" has been imported into the vocabulary of the Church from that of the medical profession. The theme of this note is that the medical analogy does not apply to the Church. There should be no distinction between the "specialist" clergymen and the "General Practitioner". The task of the Church today demands that every priest should be a specialist.

The English love of the all-rounder may be hard to lose : its consequences are going to be hard to bear. For the lack of specialisation is producing an amateurish and dilettante outlook which is irrelevant to the complex problems of modern society.

This outlook has helped to bring about the current confusion as to the role of the Minister, which is one of the main causes of the loss of nerve in the Church. This outlook, too, has blighted recruitment for the Ministry. No wonder the enthusiastic young man who might opt for the Ministry decides he can serve God better in another occupation, when he is provided with so much evidence that the Priesthood does not offer a job he can "get his teeth into".

The happy-go-lucky drift from one type of parish to another cannot produce the sort of skill which comes from being "soaked" in one aspect of modern life. And surely only such a skill can give content to any claim to stand "for the people to Godward" these days.

What then are the specialisations required? The following are some suggestions :

1. Work in the countryside
2. Work in the new housing estate.
3. Work in the suburbs.
4. Work in the inner city area.
5. Hospital chaplaincy.
6. Prison chaplaincy.
7. Industrial chaplaincy.
8. Work in the field of education and among young people.
9. Chaplaincy in the Forces.
10. Pastoral counselling.
11. Study, research, writing.

It is not suggested, of course, that the divisions should be too rigid. What is suggested is that it should be considered the normal thing for the young parson to decide which type of work he is going to do early in his Ministry and stick to that for a long time, so that he acquires an intuitive knowledge of the type of people with whom he has decided to work.

It is also suggested that the division of expertness among the clergy should be reflected in the higher ranks. Just as the Company Chairman picks his team so as to include different skills—sales, personnel, technical, financial and so on—so the Bishop should "make"* senior appointments with a view to collecting around himself a team of specialists. This would be a team of men who have taken the trouble to acquire expertness in their subjects, and such expertness should be considered in Diocesan Appointments rather than the traditional functions of the office to be filled.

In keeping with recent attempts to make the Deanery a more important unit in the Church, the Diocesan team could be reflected in the Deanery. A corollary of this conscious development of specialisation, and again parallel with industry, would be that the Diocese would have courses arranged by the senior person in the field for those who were specialising. For instance a course on work on housing estates might include :

i. Commending the Gospel to dwellers on Housing Estates.
ii. Methods of promoting Evangelism and Religious Education on Housing Estates.
iii. The Role of the Laity in the Housing Estate Church.
iv. The Social Problems of the Housing Estate.
v. Town-planning on the Housing Estate.
vi. Medical and Welfare Services on the Housing Estate.

While there would be bound to be some over-lapping between the courses, the development of a body of knowledge in one skill would produce more and more a special syllabus for that skill ; and the syllabus would presumably include :

vii. Relevant insights from other skills.

It was suggested above that greater specialisation among the clergy would help recruitment. It should also make it possible for a smaller body of professional clergy to man the Church more effectively. This would give a much greater hope for the future than panic measures to increase the number of priests. It is assumed, of course, that the specialist clergy must acquire a sure touch in their relations with the laity—not to "use" them, but to "serve" them—and that acquiring this is regarded as a matter for training and not just for propaganda.

Underlying this plea is a doctrine of the Ministry, for without such a doctrine no plans are worth laying. It is high time to recog-

* The word "Make" is in inverted commas in recognition of the fact that these appointments may not be in the hands of the Bishop.

nise that the traditional conception of the place of the Minister is being eaten away by our current consecrated inefficiency. "Specialisation" is put forward as the way in which the traditional role of the Minister needs to be exercised in modern England.

M. Z. Brooke

Letters

DOWN WITH *PRISM*!

Dear Sir,

I read *Prism*, learn much from it, enjoy it, pass it on to others. To be sure, I don't buy it—but I would do if I didn't swop a more conventional theological monthly for it by arrangement with a friend. But reading it lately I've wondered, *Quo vadis*? What is the magazine's policy? Pro-Southwark and anti-everything-else?

Month by month it flails about, vigorously, entertainingly—but dangerously. Take the July *Comment*, for example. The notes on the deployment of clergy had all the beastly character of a contemptuous observer sitting aloof from the dust of parochial life far below. Parish priests in urban areas do not run their churches "in petty competition" with each other, nor do they spend half their time "trying to invent jobs for themselves". I'm only too ready to cheer if the man next door does get somebody from my parish to go to church—there are plenty who don't. Our lives are often a wild, un-*Prism*atic whirl, contrary to all that we know our ministry should be; but in time we get a very strong impression that if our plans and policies are disastrously upset it is because God wills them to be so. We shall always be amateurs. We distrust those who are "expert in their particular field". The nature of our calling denies the possibility of "professionals".

Prism should concentrate on helping us to make the best of the Church's ramshackle organisation as it is, instead of scorning us for what it might be. Perhaps in time there will be a few parishes thriving under staffs of psychiatrists, social workers and youth organisers, as *Comment* envisages. Their vicar-bishops will thrill us with paper-backed books on how they did it and dazzle us at conferences with tales of the Kingdom of God triumphant in industrial areas. But within the lives of most of us—including, I suspect, *Prism* as well—Anglican clergymen will have to work within the familiar parochial pattern with all its disadvantages, inefficiency and loneliness. And I believe God will still work mightily through them.

Yours sincerely,

ROMFORD. JOHN T. A. GUNSTONE (Rev.)

ANGLICANISM IN UNIVERSITIES.

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your articles on the university Anglican societies. Until recently a participant, I was most interested in Hugh Dickinson's comments on *Religion in Cambridge*. The religious situation in the Australian universities is much closer to that of "red brick", with an even higher proportion of students living at home (in Adelaide about 80%). The activities of Anglican students are remarkably like those described by Raymond Chapman in *A New Movement in the Universities*.

During the past decade Anglican societies and groups have sprung up in most of the universities to provide pastoral care for students and senior members. Last June an exploratory conference was held, to consider the present state of the Anglican societies movement, and the opportunities which would be afforded by federation. We discovered the chief of these, the great value of meeting representatives of the other societies, and decided to recommend the formation of a loose federation.

One difference from the English proposal is that we do not envisage a central organisation with permanent staff. Instead, the duties of organising national conferences and providing for the exchange of news and ideas devolve upon a different member society each year. Another difference is we did not feel that graduates (apart from those remaining in the University community) should be included. On the whole, however, a similar situation has produced a closely similar approach.

Yours sincerely,

MELBOURNE. JOHN KEMSTER.

THE CULTUS AND THE KALENDAR

Dear Sir,

If it is true that the Church of England needs to revive her cultus of the saints (William Bush's article *Down Protestant Hackles* in the August *Prism* refers) it is certain that our kalendar does little to help. The 1928 kalendar did nothing to modify the jibe that the Church of England produces gentlemen not saints. The neglect of the Church's more modern saints was emphasized rather than otherwise by lumping them together under the heading, "saints, martyrs, and doctors of the Church of England". In December, 1937, the Rt. Rev. F. O. Thorne, Bishop of Nyasaland wrote to Archbishop Lang to report that he had been approached with a request to beatify a former Archdeacon of his diocese. The Archbishop saw "no kind of objection" to honouring the memory of the said Archdeacon by a collect, or even an Epistle and Gospel, but Beatification, which term he asked the Bishop not to use, "was not a

word in the vocabulary of the Anglican Church", neither was "Blessed". The Commission of 1950 reported the often excessive additions of names, both Anglican and non-Anglican to diocesan kalendars throughout the world which had followed from this ruling, but recommended no regularising of the situation with regard to the Church as a whole. The first and last Anglican canonisation was in 1544, when the Archbishop of Armagh canonised St. Richard of Dundalk.

There are at least three difficulties which we must face if we are to commemorate post-reformation Anglican saints adequately. The Puritans were commercially as well as religiously minded, and their objection to holy days (that is, holidays) has survived among Evangelicals today. The Bishop of Mombasa, for example, answered the Commission of 1958 with a protest at "just cluttering up the kalendar with names", and the Bishop of Central Tanganyika, it seems, consigned the Commission's enquiries to the wastepaper basket. Nevertheless, the Protestant wing of the Church has produced many men and women of very real sanctity, possessing the Pauline virtues to the full. There are even two churches (both in Birmingham) dedicated to Hugh Latimer, and the nineteenth-century Evangelical, Bishop Rider. Another serious difficulty arises in connection with post-Reformation saints of the Roman obedience. There one has to admit to undoubted holiness on the part of many such saints, who are moreover, in many cases greatly honoured by Anglicans.

The great problem however lies in initiating a process of canonisation. Dr. Lowther-Clarke wrote, in 1932, "no processes of Saint-making as those in vogue at Rome are thinkable in the Church of England at present". (*Liturgy and Worship*). In 1958 the Archbishop's Commission claimed that such a process was "unnecessary". "The demand for recognition comes from below", and "the Anglican Commission's primary method of 'Recognition' is the placing, by province or diocese of a name in its kalendar". This latter is, of course, in line with both Eastern and pre-papal Western practice. In other systems, however, although holiness is rightly recognised as the gift of God alone, there is also a formal ceremony after which the person is called "Saint . . . " and it is permitted to dedicate churches and chapels in his or her name. Is such a system so utterly undesirable? In the West General Councils were supposed to canonise, so why not make it possible for the individual bishop, at the request of his diocese, to bring before the Lambeth Conference (or some similar body) names already commemorated on the diocesan or provincial kalendar? Such a name might be, for example, that of Edward King of Lincoln. The Conference could appoint a committee of investigation which would report back after due time, and the Conference then approve the name, and instruct the appropriate metropolitan, using a rite approved by the Conference, to proceed with recognition. To avoid unnecessary

difficulties it would be as well to deal only with Anglicans, and furthermore to deal with only fairly recent figures, rather than wrestle with the knotty problems of the Reformation. This procedure would not remove existing local observances decreed by dioceses, provinces, religious orders and the like, but would encourage the average Anglican to speak, for example, of St. John Keble, and a gentleman's agreement, one hopes, would prevent dedication to uncanonized Anglicans, as it now prevents dedications to post-Reformation Roman Catholic Saints. Among names which require immediate attention here are William Temple, James Hannington, King Charles I, and Lancelot Andrews, all of whom have churches dedicated to them.

Another attack which is sometimes levied against the kalendar of 1928 is that while it includes many saints who are largely unknown, and have no churches dedicated to them, it fails to include some of the more popular dedications such as Sts. Botolph, Edith, and Helen. Its most glaring omission, as is well known, is that of St. Joseph, a biblical saint, who ought to have "red-letter" rank. It has been suggested in contrast to this, that the numerous dedications to St. Ann, an aprocryphal figure of doubtful historicity, spring from the gratitude of recipients of Queen Anne's Bounty!

Yours sincerely,

G. E. Cooke.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Donald Allchin is joining the staff at Pusey House, Oxford; R. M. Appleby is Professor of Geology at Cardiff; Brian Rice has been appointed Diocesan Adviser on Christian Stewardship to the Bishop of Derby; Gina Alexander used to be Gina Pirani; M. Z. Brooke is a TV-expert vicar in Manchester; Valerie Pitt is senior lecturer in English at Woolwich Polytechnic.